

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

If they are allowed to run such a blatantly biased report, will they be required to run an equally biased, anti-Bush documentary? Or, a pro-Kerry documentary? It's my understanding that equal time to candidates is the law, and if I am wrong, than this is another example of why the laws controlling monopolies isn't being applied correctly.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.